

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated May 14, 2008. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-12 are under consideration in this application. Claims 1-10 are being amended, as set forth in the above marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim Applicants' invention. New claims 11-12 are being added.

All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejection

The drawings were objected to under 37 CFR §1.83(a) for not showing all features recited in the claims. Since the specification is being amended to recite “a packet operation unit 110 (i.e., a transmission/reception unit) for receiving a packet from a client and for transmitting the received packet to a destination address” and “an address generation unit/apparatus 562”, the requested components are respectively shown in fig. 1 and Fig. 8. As such, the withdrawal of the outstanding informality rejections is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Takeda (U.S. Pat. No. 6,829,232). This rejection has been carefully considered, but is most respectfully traversed, as more fully discussed below.

The connection management apparatus (e.g., a gateway in Fig. 2) connectable via a communication network to both a first terminal and a second terminal of the present invention, as now recited in claim 1, comprises: a transmission/reception unit 110 (Fig. 2) connectable to said communication network; a CPU 50002 connected to said communication network; and a memory 50008 connected to said transmission/reception unit 110 and further connected to said CPU 50002. When a connection request issued from said first terminal to said second terminal is

received by said transmission/reception unit, said CPU reads out a program from said memory and executes the program to judge whether or not a first connection can be established from said first terminal to said second terminal; and when said first connection cannot be established as a result of said judgement, said CPU furthermore reads out a program from said memory and executes the program to generate an address required for establishing a second connection by which said first terminal is connectable to said second terminal and then to transmit data containing said generated address from said transmission/reception unit to said first terminal (*“address management apparatus 56 produces a connection address which is required when a detour connection is performed.”* p. 9, lines 4-6; *“The detour address registration table 130 registers therein a set of a real address 13020 and a detour address 13010, which as used when a detour connection is made.”* p. 10, lines 7-10; *“A detour address corresponds to such an address which is allocated by the address management apparatus 56 in the case that a communication is made in a detour connection.”* p. 10, lines 24-27).

As recited in claim 3, when said first connection cannot be established as a result of said judgement, said CPU further reads out a program from said memory and executes the program to retrieve a communication path of said second connection from said first terminal to said second terminal; and only when said communication path is available in said memory and retrieved accordingly, said CPU executes the second program and generates said address.

As recited in claim 5, when said first connection can be established as a result of the judgement, said CPU further reads out a program from said memory and executes the program to authenticate said first terminal and then generates said address after authentication of said first terminal is succeeded.

The new claim 11 recites claim 5 and claim 3, and the new claim 12 defines said address required for establishing said second connection as being generated by applying an address available for use in a second network, which is different from a first network the first terminal is located, to the first terminal as a detour address of the first terminal, and the first terminal communicates with the second terminal via the second network of the second connection. (*“the address management apparatus 56 applies an address usable in the network-2 20 to the client-1 10 as a detour address. Since the communication-purpose address in the network-2 2 is allocated to the client-1 10, the client-1 10 can be communicated with the client-3 30 via the network-2 20, namely by employing the detour path.”* p. 22, lines 2-8).

The invention of claim 10 is directed to a data processing method of the connection management apparatus of claim 1 which further includes an address generation apparatus 562 (Fig. 8), and when said first connection cannot be established as a result of said judgement, said

CPU transmits a request for generating an address required for establishing a second connection by which said first terminal can be connected to said second terminal from said transmission/reception unit to said address generation apparatus.

The invention of claim 6 is directed to a connection control system the connection management apparatus of claim 1 and the address generation apparatus of claim 11 and other detailed description of their operations.

Applicants respectfully submit that Takeda does not teach or suggest “judging whether or not a first connection can be established from said first terminal to said second terminal; and when said first connection cannot be established as a result of said judgement, generating an address required for establishing a second connection by which said first terminal is connectable to said second terminal” as the present invention.

In contrast, Takeda’s server 3a only supports communication between an IP network and a service control point (SCP) by using the correspondence information between a telephone number of a terminal and an IP address stored in its memory 42 (Abstract). When the source terminal and the destination terminal are located in two different areas, the telephone number of the destination terminal 9a is compared with the information stored in the memory 42 to determine the class of the destination terminal number (Step 54 in Fig. 5; col. 7, lines 56-60). If the destination terminal number is in the class in which its address CAN be resolved from the information stored in the memory 42, the IP address of the gateway corresponding to the destination terminal number or the IP address of the server which manages the gateway and the information of the channel for the call process are retrieved to perform a call setup process (Step 55 -> Step 64 in Fig. 5; col. 7, lines 61-67). However, when the destination terminal number is in the class in which its address can NOT be resolved from the information stored in the memory 42 such that an inquiry to the IN is necessary, Takeda proceeds to processings regarding interrogation sent to other servers 3b and 3c (col. 8, lines 3-18). In other words, Takeda merely determines whether an address of a destination terminal number can be resolved from the information stored in the memory 42 of the server 3a to decide whether to interrogate other servers 3b and 3c for the address of the destination terminal number, but not to “determine whether a first connection can be established from said first terminal to said second terminal to decide whether to generate an address required for establishing a second connection by which said first terminal is connectable to said second terminal” as the present invention. Takeda concentrates on getting “an address of a destination terminal number”, rather than “establishing a second connection” or “an address required for establishing a second connection.”

Applicants contend that the cited references and their combinations fail to teach or

disclose each and every feature of the present invention as recited in at least independent claims 1, 6 and 10. As such, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the rejections raised in the Office Action. The withdrawal of the outstanding prior art rejections is in order, and is respectfully solicited.


Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicant respectfully contends that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

July 31, 2008

SPF/JCM/JT